

REMARKS

This Response is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 3, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks and arguments are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-7 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. 5,550,657 (Tanaka) in view of JP-02-221829 (Hattori). Further, claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Hattori and U.S. 6,568,820 (Ohkawa). It is respectfully resubmitted that claims 1-9 and 11-16 are patentable over Tanaka, Hattori and Ohkawa for at least the following reasons.

Tanaka is directed to a back-lit reflective liquid crystal display (LCD) device that includes a planar illumination unit 3 having a cold cathode tube 6, as shown in FIG 1. As recited on column 2, lines 9-10, "it is important to reduce the loss of the light that has been emitted by the cold cathode tube 6" both to provide a brighter display and reduce power consumption.

As correctly noted by the Examiner on top of page 3 of the Final Office Action Tanaka does not teach or suggest the following features of the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

light absorbing means adjacent said non-random light-scattering structure and configured to absorb light scattered from said non-random light-scattering structure,

and as recited in independent claim 11 which requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

a mounting portion extending from the lens element, said mounting portion having spaced parallel surfaces that extend perpendicularly to said optical axis;

a light-scattering structure configured to couple out light entering said mounting portion, said light-scattering structure being located on at least one of said spaced parallel surfaces; and

a light absorber configured to absorb light scattered from said light-scattering structure.

Hattori is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Tanaka.

Hattori is directed to an optical fiber for a temperature sensor that includes liquid crystal material in a clad 1 surrounding a glass core 1. In the liquid crystal, scattered light

changes in accordance with a used temperature area contained in the clad 2. Thus, the temperature of the Hattori optical fiber is determined by measuring the change of the transmission loss.

It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not arrive to the present invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 11 from the combination of Tanaka and Hattori without impermissible hindsight. Where would the optical fiber Hattori be placed in the LCD display of Tanaka? What purpose is served by including in the Tanaka LCD display the light scattering and absorbing Hattori clad layer 2 that allows determination of temperature based on the transmission loss through the Hattori optical fiber?

Such a combination of Tanaka and Hattori would reduce light output or luminosity of the LCD display which is the exact opposite effect desired by Tanaka. Tanaka strives to reduce light loss as recited on column 2, lines 9-10, which is reproduced above, as well as the title being "Liquid Crystal Display Device Having an Optimized Ridged Layer to Improve Luminosity." (Emphasis added)

The Hattori optical fiber would absorb and thus reduce light output or luminosity. Thus, the combination of the Tanaka LCD

display and the Hattori optical fiber would result in a display having reduced luminosity. Reducing luminosity is the opposite goal of Tanaka which is concerned with increasing luminosity. Hattori is not concerned about any light absorbing means to absorb light from a light scattering structure, let alone having such a light absorbing means adjacent a non-random light-scattering structure, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

There is simply no teaching or suggestion in Tanaka and Hattori, alone or in combination, of a light absorbing structure configured to absorb light from a non-random light-scattering structure, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Ohkawa is cited in rejecting dependent claims to allegedly show other features, and does not remedy the deficiencies of Tanaka.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1 and 11 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-9 and 12-16 should also be allowed based at least on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 11.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the

foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
May 10, 2007

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101